LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Office-Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
NOV 27 1951
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1951

No. 165

NORMAN H. BUCK AND MIGUEL R. GUERRA,
Apellants,

vs.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Appellee

OPENING BRIEF ON BEHALF OF APPELLANTS

MANUEL RUIZ, JR.,
MORRIS LAVINE,
Counsel for Appellants.



INDEX

Subject Index

	Page
Opening brief on behalf of appellants	1
Opinion below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Statutes involved	2
Short statement of the facts	9
Locale	11
Summary of argument	12
1. The lower court failed to consider and pass upon the point that the appellants and each of them were deprived of their constitutional rights, under color of law	14
2. The lower court stated that an annual fee of $1.00 for administrative costs on foreign commerce was not unreasonable but failed to pass upon the reasonableness of the $50.00 annual fee about which the appellants complained	18
3. The statute, inherently and as construed and applied in this case, unreasonably burdens commerce between the friendly republic of Mexico and the United States of America	21
4. The ordinance inherently places in the hands of a single executive and administrative officer, the Sheriff, the power to grant or revoke a license upon his whim, will and discretion	34
5. The ordinance is in conflict with the National Transportation Policy Act, (49 U.S.C.A. 301-327) which, by regulations, covers taxicabs in respect to general definitions, hours of service, *quali-*	

Page

fications of drivers, driving of motor vehicles, accident reports, inspection and maintenance and carrying of explosives and other dangerous articles by motor vehicles 37

6. The Commerce Clause of the Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Section 3 was designed to reach state legislation which practically obstructs commerce, as well as that which expresses hostility toward it 38

7. The ordinance contains no special prohibitions relating to police powers and reasonably related to its purpose 39

Table of Cases Cited

"A"

Aero Mayflower Transit Co. v. *Board of Railroad Commissioners*, 332 U. S. 495, 92 L. Ed. 99 21

Asher v. *Texas*, 128 U. S. 129, 32 L. Ed. 368, 2 Inters. Com. Rep. 241, 9 Sup. Ct. Rep. 1 30

"B"

Baldwin v. *G.A.F. Seelig, Inc.*, 94 U. S. 511, 527, 79 L. Ed. 1032, 1040, 55 S. Ct. 497, 101 ALR 55 41

Barrett v. *New York*, 232 U. S. 14, 31, 58 L. Ed. 483, 490, 34 Sup. Ct. Rep. 203 30

Bell v. *Porter*, 159 Fed. (2) 117 38

Bob-Lo Excursion Co. v. *Michigan case*, 333 U. S. 28 16

Bowman v. *Chicago & N. W. R. Co.*, 125 U. S. 465, 31 L. Ed. 700, I Inters. Com. Rep. 823, 8 Sup. Ct. Rep. 689, 1062 28

Brennan v. *Titusville*, 153 U. S. 289, 38 L. Ed. 719, 4 Inters. Com. Rep. 658, 14 Sup. Ct. Rep. 829 29

Brown v. *Houston*, 114 U. S. 622, 631, 29 L. Ed. 257, 260, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep. 1091 29

Brown v. *Maryland*, 12 Wheat. r19, 6 L. Ed. 678 28

Buck v. *Kuykendall*, 267 U. S. 307, 69 L. Ed. 623, 45 S. Ct. 324, 38 I ALR 286 22